

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 18 are amended. Claims 1-25 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks amendments and/or remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Examiner Communication

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the claim amendments that Applicant previously submitted to the Examiner on September 13, 2005. In the spirit of the claim amendments that Applicant previously submitted for consideration, Applicant has amended the above claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned if there are any questions regarding the nature of the claim amendments. In addition, before issuing a further office action, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to advance prosecution in this matter.

The Claim Rejections

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,744,472 to MacInnis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,279 to Richter.

The Claims

Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 1 • receiving a command from a decoder application at an application
2 program interface (API), *wherein the API is configured to facilitate
3 the use of a plurality of different multimedia accelerators with the
4 decoder application*; and
- 5 • generating one or more filter control command data structures,
6 recognizable by a communicatively coupled accelerator including
7 one or more parameters which, when received by the accelerator,
8 affects one or more filter settings of the accelerator based, at least in
9 part, on the content of the received command.

10 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
11 matter is rendered obvious in view of MacInnis and Richter. Specifically, the
12 Office argues that MacInnis discloses all of the features of the claim except for an
13 application interface. The Office then relies on Richter and argues that it discloses
14 an application interface. As such, the Office argues that the combination of these
15 two references would be motivated by a desire to obtain an apparatus that is more
16 versatile by being able to perform complex operations.

17 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and submits that the Office
18 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for reasons not the least of
19 which is that the motivation to combine the references is too general and could
20 serve as the basis for making any modification of MacInnis. Applicant reserves its
21 right to further argue against the *prima facie* case in a continuation application.

22 Nonetheless, and in a sincere effort to advance prosecution in this matter,
23 Applicant has amended the claim as indicated above, support for which can be
24 found, among other places, in the application's "Summary" section. Applicant
25 respectfully submits that neither reference discloses or suggests the subject matter
of this claim as amended. As such, this claim is allowable.

1 **Claims 2-11** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
2 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
3 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
4 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
5 another

6 **Claim 12** has been amended and, as amended, recites a storage medium
7 comprising a plurality of executable instructions which, when executed,
8 implement an application program interface (API) to dynamically generate one or
9 more filter control command data structures in response to a command received
10 from a decoder application, wherein the one or more filter control command data
11 structure(s) include one or more parameters which, when received by a
12 communicatively coupled accelerator, effect one or more filter settings on the
13 accelerator in accordance with the received command, *wherein the API is not*
14 *specific to any particular multimedia application and/or multimedia accelerator.*

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
16 matter is rendered obvious in view of MacInnis and Richter. Specifically, the
17 Office argues that MacInnis discloses all of the features of the claim except for an
18 application interface. The Office then relies on Richter and argues that it discloses
19 an application interface. As such, the Office argues that the combination of these
20 two references would be motivated by a desire to obtain an apparatus that is more
21 versatile by being able to perform complex operations.

22 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and submits that the Office
23 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for reasons not the least of
24 which is that the motivation to combine the references is too general and could
25

1 serve as the basis for making any modification of MacInnis. Applicant reserves its
2 right to further argue against the *prima facie* case in a continuation application.

3 Nonetheless, and in a sincere effort to advance prosecution in this matter,
4 Applicant has amended the claim as indicated above, support for which can be
5 found, among other places, in the specification on page 15, lines 3-24. Applicant
6 respectfully submits that neither reference discloses or suggests the subject matter
7 of this claim as amended. As such, this claim is allowable.

8 Claims 13-17 depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from
9 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
10 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed
11 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
12 another

13 Claim 18 has been amended and, as amended, recites a computing system
14 comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 15
- 16 • a decoder application to process received media content; and
 - 17 • an operating system including an application program interface
18 (API), support the media processing, wherein the API generates one
19 or more filter control commands including one or more parameters
20 which, when received by a communicatively coupled media
21 processing accelerator, effect one or more filter settings of the
22 accelerator in accordance with a command received from the
23 decoder, ***wherein the decoder application is configured to
iteratively issue configuration commands reflecting various
alternative degrees and methods of decoding acceleration
capability until choosing one that is acceptable to both the decoder
application and the accelerator.***

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject
25 matter is rendered obvious in view of MacInnis and Richter. Specifically, the

1 Office argues that MacInnis discloses all of the features of the claim except for an
2 application interface. The Office then relies on Richter and argues that it discloses
3 an application interface. As such, the Office argues that the combination of these
4 two references would be motivated by a desire to obtain an apparatus that is more
5 versatile by being able to perform complex operations.

6 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and submits that the Office
7 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for reasons not the least of
8 which is that the motivation to combine the references is too general and could
9 serve as the basis for making any modification of MacInnis. Applicant reserves its
10 right to further argue against the *prima facie* case in a continuation application.

11 Nonetheless, and in a sincere effort to advance prosecution in this matter,
12 Applicant has amended the claim as indicated above, support for which can be
13 found, among other places, in the specification from page 55, line 1 through page
14 56, line 13. Applicant respectfully submits that neither reference discloses or
15 suggests the subject matter of this claim as amended. As such, this claim is
16 allowable.

17 Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18 and are allowable as depending from
18 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
19 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 18, are neither disclosed
20 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
21 another

22 23 Conclusion

24 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
25 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next

1 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,
2 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of discussing an
3 appeal.

4 Respectfully Submitted,

5
6 Dated: 10/26/05

By: 

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256